

cause it was across a dividing line—that that was *ipso facto* to all intents and purposes, a dissolution of the Union. Therefore it was that I would have voted for anybody to defeat Mr. Lincoln. Nor am I alone in that opinion.

“If we of the northern States will not vote for a southern man, merely because he is a southern man; and men of the south will not vote for a northern man, merely because he is a northern man; and if that principle is to be carried out in all our national politics, what must be the result? Disunion. That itself is disunion. You may disguise and cover it up as you please, but that it will be. It may be regarded as the first step in disunion, but its consequences follow as inevitably as fate. One section—the north or the south—must always have the majority. Disfranchise all upon the other side, and the Union cannot hold together a day; it ought not to hold together upon such conditions a day.”

Now, do gentlemen want to know who said this? It is a gentleman of whom we have all heard; it is the hero of Vienna; the late Maj. Gen. Robert C. Schenck.

There are some things which have been asserted in the progress of this discussion, that I could have wished had not been asserted. I believe, as the late President of the United States did, that there is no power in this Government to wage war rightfully against a recusant State. I believe that is *casus omnisus*; the power not having been given, it cannot be rightfully exercised. And because Mr. Buchanan took that view, and acted upon his conscientious convictions of duty, as we are bound to believe, we have heard heaped upon his head anathemas and denunciations such as I have rarely ever heard. I am not his apologist or his defender; I did not vote for him; I did not sustain his administration. But when he, an aged man, having discharged his term of office, under the convictions of his duty, his oath, and the responsibilities attaching to his station—when, because of the exercise of what he believed his duty in that respect, he has been assailed in terms of vituperation, of denunciation and abuse, and they are echoed back by the response of “amen” by the gentleman from Howard, (Mr. Sands,) I could not help thinking that the hatred, the spleen, the venom evinced in those remarks, fitted those gentlemen for anything else than the position of censor. Certainly they evinced very little of the spirit of Him who, when reviled, reviled not back again.

There was another gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Cushing,) who used the expression—that the Chief Justice of the United States had stultified himself. Judge Taney had stultified himself! And has it come to this, that any one in the rage and spirit of party can thus pronounce sentence upon the

Chief Justice of the United States? A man whose life has been one of usefulness, who is now bending beneath the weight of his three score and ten years, and trembling upon the very verge of that grave to which we are all fast hastening. It did seem to me that in consideration of the position and of the age—of the final account which that venerable justice must soon render to the Judge of all the living, he might at least have been spared these censures, because the chief justice decided a point which came before him legitimately in the progress of a cause. It has been said the point was not before the court, and that he went outside of the record to decide it. Sir, whether or not that question was before the Court, was one of the very points raised and discussed in that “Dred Scott case,” and that it was there properly is as much a part of the decision as any other part of it.

I wanted, some days ago, in the course of this discussion, to respond to an allusion which was made to the late Legislature of this State. I was a member of that Legislature. The strong hand of power, without law, without right, without justice; in defiance of all law, in defiance of States’ rights, in defiance of every principle of justice, was laid upon that Legislature, and some of its members were sent to Fort Warren. It was heralded throughout the length and breadth of this land that they were secessionists, that they intended to carry Maryland out of this Union. Sir, as a member of that Legislature, knowing I believe every member of it, and intimate with the most of them, I say the charge is false, come it whence it may. A petition came up from Prince George’s county, asking that the Legislature pass an ordinance of secession. The very same day it came into the House it was referred to a committee, consisting of Mr. Wallis, Mr. Long, myself, Mr. Briscoe and Mr. Compton. The committee immediately met, and on the same day presented the following report:

“To the Honorable the Speaker
of the House of Delegates:

“The Committee on Federal Relations, to whom has been referred the ‘memorial of two hundred and sixteen voters of Prince George’s county, praying the Legislature (if in its judgment it possesses the power) to pass an ordinance of secession without delay,’ ask leave respectfully to report that in their judgment the Legislature does *not* possess the power to pass such an ordinance as is prayed, and that the prayer of the said memorialists cannot, therefore, be granted.

S. T. WALLIS,
EDWARD LONG,
JAMES U. DENNIS,
JAMES T. BRISCOE,
BARNES COMPTON.”

Which was adopted.